

Reply to Office Action dated April 3, 2008

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21, 23-25, 27-35 and 37 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 11, 13-14, 18-19, 21, 24-25, 32-33 and 37 are amended. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. §101. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments to independent claim 33 obviates the grounds for rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12, 18-21, 23-25, 27-35 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,272,545 to Flanagan et al. (hereafter Flanagan) in view of U.S. Patent 5,999,937 to Ellard. The Office Action also rejects claims 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Flanagan in view of newly-cited U.S. Patent 5,392,390 to Crozier and Ellard. The rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites composing data in a first application program of a plurality of application programs embedded in the PDA, the data being of a first format, wherein composing the data includes entering data in an input screen associated with the first application program. Independent claim 1 also recites selecting a conversion of the entered data from the first format to a second format suitable for a second application program, and in response to selecting the conversion, providing an information input window for a user to enter data for the second application program, and the user entering data into the information input window. Independent claim 1 further recites converting the entered data to the second format of the plurality of application programs using a conversion program provided in the PDA, and storing

Reply to Office Action dated April 3, 2008

the converted data in a database associated with the second application program, the database provided in the PDA, wherein each of the plurality of application programs is selectively operated in the PDA, and wherein the first application program, the conversion program and the second application program are initiated and executed on the PDA, the conversion program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into data in a format of any other of the plurality of application programs.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, Flanagan and Ellard, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest features of independent claim 1 in a personal data assistant (PDA). That is, independent claim 1 relates to a plurality of application programs embedded in a PDA. Independent claim 1 further recites that each of the plurality of application programs is selectively operated in the PDA. However, the references do not relate to operations in a PDA.

The Office Action primarily relies on Flanagan to reject independent claim 1. However, Flanagan only briefly describes a personal information manager (PIM). See col. 11, line 57-col. 12, line 32, and PIM 5A in FIG. 6A. However, the PIM 5A is an application such as “SCHEDULE” and “OUTLOOK.” Flanagan’s operations that are cited in the Office Action relate to interactions between a computer and a plurality of mobile devices. Flanagan does not suggest the respective features of independent claim 1 performed in a PDA. Rather, Flanagan relates to interactions between a mobile device and a personal computer, for example.

The Office Action states that Flanagan’s col. 12, lines 19-25 and 38-40 and col. 11, lines 4-28 teaches updating data between two different databases. However, the cited sections of

Flanagin relate to interactions between a mobile device 3A and a desktop computer 4. This does not suggest operations in a PDA and/or a plurality of application programs embedded in the PDA. Thus, in view of the explicit claim language within independent claim 1, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Ellard discloses transferring and converting data between different entities such as a first database (having a first data set 22) and a second-database ((having a second data set 24) external from the first database. This is performed by a data exchange (DX) system 26 that may be a software application executed by a computer system. See FIG. 1 and col. 3, lines 37-62. Ellard has no suggestion for performing operations in a PDA. Therefore, Ellard does not teach or suggest a conversion program provided in a PDA and/or the conversion program initiated and executed on the PDA.

Further, the modification of Flanagin to include Ellard's teachings as alleged on page 5 of the Office Action would result in a server that includes a data exchange server since Ellard clearly relies on the use of the DX system 26 to perform the alleged converting. Thus, the use of a DX system 26 in Flanagin does not suggest the claimed features of a plurality of application programs embedded in a PDA and/or a conversion program provided in the PDA. Ellard also does not contain any indication that conversion of data from one set to a second set may be provided within a PDA.

Additionally, Flanagin and Ellard do not teach or suggest composing data in a first application program including entering data in an input screen associated with the first application program, selecting a conversion of the entered data from the first format to a second

Reply to Office Action dated April 3, 2008

format and in response to selecting conversion, providing an information input window for a user to enter data for the second application program, and the user entering data into the information input window in combination with converting the entered data to the second format.

The Office Action (on page 7) states that Flanagan does not teach or suggest the features of the claimed information input window (provided in previous dependent claim 6). The Office Action then cites Ellard's col. 7, lines 7-63 as teaching that the input data is gathered and determinations are made regarding the required conversions. However, these features do not teach or suggest providing an information input window for a user to enter data and the user entering data into the information input window. Rather, the cited section of Ellard relates to a previously entered data set 22 provided in a database that is converted by a DX 26 and provided to another database. The cited section of Ellard merely relates to a method in which an operator may change a conversion process after reviewing the previously-input data set. Ellard's col. 7 does not relate to providing an information input window for a user to enter data and the user entering data into the information input window. Furthermore, the applied references do not teach or suggest converting the entered data to the second format.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Flanagan and Ellard do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. The other applied references do not teach or suggest the missing features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 13 recites entering data including a prescribed identifier code in a first one of a plurality of application programs in the PDA, the prescribed identifier code to indicate a second one of the plurality of application programs into which the entered data is to be stored. Independent claim 13 also recites selecting the second application program among the plurality of application programs based on the prescribed identifier code using a table that matches prescribed identifier codes to corresponding application programs, and converting a format of the entered data from a first format to a second format using a conversion program provided in the PDA, the second format corresponding to a format required by the second application program.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 13. More specifically, the applied references do not teach or suggest features relating to a PDA such as a plurality of application programs in a PDA, a conversion program provided in the PDA and a database provided in the PDA. Crozier relates to mapping facilities DP DTMAP 129 in a desktop computer 115. Thus, Crozier also does not suggest the features relating to the PDA.

Flanagin, Crozier and Ellard also do not teach or suggest entering data including a prescribed identifier code in a first one of a plurality of application programs, selecting the second application program based on the prescribed identifier code using a table that matches prescribed identifier codes and converting a format of the entered data from a first format to a second format using a conversion program, the second format corresponding to a format required by the second application program.

When discussing the claimed prescribed identifier code, the Office Action (on page 14) states that Flanagan does not teach having a prescribed identifier code. The Office Action then cites Crozier's col. 3, lines 56-66, col. 5, lines 43-49 and col. 8, lines 40-56 for these alleged features. However, these features do not relate entering data including a prescribed identifier code in a first application program to indicate a second one of the plurality of application programs in combination with selecting the second application program based on the prescribed identifier code. That is, Crozier's identification of a desktop application name in a database field does not suggest entering data in a first application, selecting the second application program and converting. Crozier does not relate to selection and conversion based on the prescribed identifier code (that has been entered).

For at least the reasons set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 13. Independent claim 13 therefore defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 18 recites entering data by a user in a first one of a plurality of application programs embedded in the PDA, each of the plurality of application programs having mutually different data formats, wherein the first application program is a document editing program, and selecting a second application program in which to store the entered data. Independent claim 18 also recites converting the entered data by the user in the document editing program to a second format used by the second application program using a conversion program providing in the PDA, the second application program comprising one of a contact manager, an appointment scheduler, a telephone number organizer or a task list. Still further,

Reply to Office Action dated April 3, 2008

independent claim 18 recites storing the converted data in the second application program, wherein the first application program, the conversion program and the second application program are initiated and executed on the PDA, the conversion program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into data in a format of any other one of the plurality of application programs.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 18. More specifically, Flanagin and Ellard do not teach or suggest entering data in a first one of a plurality of application programs embedded in the PDA, wherein the first application program is a document editing program in combination with converting the entered data in the document editing program to a second format used by the second application program using a conversion program provided in the PDA and the second application program comprises one of a contact manager, an appointment scheduler, a telephone number organizer or a task list.

When discussing features of the document editing program and the contact manager/appointment scheduler/telephone number organizer/task list, the Office Action (on page 3) cites Flanagin's col. 1, lines 36-38, col. 11, lines 57-66 and col. 13, lines 25-32. However, this clearly does not suggest any type of converting the entered data by the user in a document editing program to a second format used by a second application program. Additionally, Ellard's conversion is of previously input data from a first database to another external database. Thus, Ellard does not suggest converting the entered data by the user in a document editing program.

Additionally, Flanagin and Ellard do not teach or suggest the plurality of application programs embedded in the PDA and a conversion program provided in the PDA.

For at least these reasons, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 18. Thus, independent claim 18 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 25 recites an input/output interface of the PDA, configured to receive commands from a user and to display information, the input/output interface to enter data associated with a first application program based on inputs of a user, the entered data including an identification marker to identify a second application program. Independent claim 25 also recites a central processing unit (CPU) of the PDA, and a memory of the PDA, configured to accommodate a plurality of databases associated with a plurality of application programs, the plurality of databases provided in the PDA. Independent claim 25 also recites that a first application program stored on the PDA is configured to receive and store data in a first database using a first data format, a second application program stored on the PDA is configured to receive and store data in a second database using a second data format, the second data format selected based on the identification marker that identifies the second application program.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Flanagan and Ellard do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 25. More specifically, Flanagan and Ellard do not relate to the features of a personal data assistant (PDA). Flanagan and Ellard also do not teach or suggest that the input/output interface to enter data associated with a first application program based on inputs of the user, the entered data including an identification marker to identify a second application program, and the second data format selected based on the identification marker input by the user that identifies the second application program. Flanagan and Ellard



does not suggest the identification marker (input by the user) to identify a second application program.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Flanagan and Ellard do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 25. Crozier does not teach or suggest missing features. Thus, independent claim 25 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 33 recites features of a PDA such as a first application program, a second application program. Still further, independent claim 33 recites an input/output interface of the PDA to receive commands from a user and to display information, the input/output interface to enter data associated with the first application program based on inputs by the user, the entered data including an identification marker input by the user to identify the second application program.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Flanagan and Ellard do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 33. More specifically, Flanagan and Ellard do not relate to the features of a personal data assistant (PDA). Flanagan and Ellard also do not teach or suggest the input/output interface to enter data associated with the first application program based on inputs by the user, the entered data including an identification marker input by the user to identify the second application program. Crozier does not teach or suggest the missing features. Thus, independent claim 33 defines patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 13, 18, 25 and 33 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and

Serial No. **10/036,378**

Docket No. **LT-0010**

Reply to Office Action dated April 3, 2008

therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-21, 23-25, 27-35 and 37 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



David C. Oren

Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

**Date: July 2, 2008**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**